UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2927
8 June 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 8 June 1990, at 6 p.m.

President:	Mr. BLANC	(France)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. DING Yuanhong
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Mr. TORNUDD
	Malaysia	Mr. HASMY
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. VORONTSOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Crispin TICKELL
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Yemen	Mr. AL-ALFI
	Zaire	Mr. KIBIDI NGOVUKA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 6 p.m.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO THE RETIRING PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): As this is the first meeting of the Security Council for the month of June, I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute, on behalf of the Council, to His Excellency Mr. Klaus Törnudd, Permanent Representative of Finland to the United Nations, for his service as President of the Security Council for the month of May 1990. I am sure I speak for all members of the Security Council in expressing deep appreciation to Ambassador Törnudd for the great diplomatic skill and unfailing courtesy with which he conducted the Council's business last month.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

CENTRAL AMERICA: EFFORTS TOWARDS PEACE

REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS OBSERVER GROUP IN CENTRAL AMERICA (S/21341 and S/21349)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them a report of the Secretary-General, dated 4 June 1990, on the United Nations Observer Group in Central America, document S/21341. Members of the Council have also received photocopies, in English and French, of the report made by the Secretary-General today, which will be published as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/21349. Members have before them document S/21350, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations. I should also like to draw attention to document S/21347, which contains the text of a letter dated 7 June 1990 from the Permanent Representatives of Spain and Venezuela to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

READEX FICHE

(The President)

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution (S/21350) before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Zaire

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has accordingly been adopted unanimously as resolution 656 (1990).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.05 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2928
15 June 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-EIGHTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 15 June 1990, at 3 p.m.

President:	Mr. BLANC	(France)
Members :	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. LI Daoyu
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ZAMORA RODRIGUEZ
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Mr. TORNUDD
	Malaysia	Mr. RAZALI
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. VORONTSOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. RICHARDSON
	United States of America	Mr. WILKINSON
	Yemen	Mr. AL-ASHTAL
	Zaire	Mr. KIBIDI NGOVUKA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 3.55 p.m.

EXPRESSION OF WELCOME

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): On behalf of the Security Council I wish to bid a warm welcome at the Council table to the new Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations, His Excellency Mr. Li Daoyu. We look forward to co-operating with him in our work.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN CYPRUS

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS OPERATION IN CYPRUS (S/21340 and Add.1)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Cyprus, Greece and Turkey in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mavrommatis (Cyprus), Mr. Zepos (Greece) and Mr. Aksin (Turkey) took places at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I should like to recall that in the course of the Council's consultations members of the Council agreed that an invitation should be extended to Mr. Ozer Koray in accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Council decides to invite Mr. Koray in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

(The President)

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the appropriate moment I shall invite Mr. Koray to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus for the period 1 December 1989 to 31 May 1990, documents S/21340 and Addendum 1. Members of the Council also have before them a draft resolution contained in document S/21357, which has been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear an objection, I shall put the draft resolution (S/21357) to the vote now. There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Zaire

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has therefore been adopted unanimously as resolution 657 (1990). I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. FORTIER (Canada) (interpretation from French): Since this is the first time I have spoken at a formal meeting this month, I wish first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency. We are convinced that your enormous talents as an experienced diplomat will ensure the success of our deliberations.

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

I also wish to take this opportunity to thank our colleague, Ambassador Tornudd of Finland, for the exceptional manner in which he presided over our deliberations during the very busy month of May.

Once again Canada voted in favour of the further extension of the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) because we remain convinced that UNFICYP continues to play a vital role in helping to create the necessary conditions for a negotiated settlement to the Cyprus problem. Our commitment to UNFICYP is further underscored by our decision to continue the deployment of Canadian troops as part of the Force.

In its dual capacity as a troop-contributor of long standing to UNFICYP and as a member of the Security Council, however, we are very concerned about the continuing precarious state of UNFICYP's finances. UNFICYP is the only United Nations peace-keeping operation that is financed from voluntary contributions. These voluntary contributions are consistently insufficient to meet the United Nations portion of the cost of the Force. As a result, the troop-contributing nations, including Canada, have been obliged to carry an inordinately heavy share of the cost of the Force.

As the Secretary-General noted in his latest report on the United Nations operation in Cyprus, the deficit in the UNFICYP account now stands at more than $179 million. Troop-contributing countries have therefore been reimbursed for their expenses only up to December 1980 - which is almost a period of 10 years.

This deplorable situation cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely. As you know, Mr. President, Canada has been working actively within the Council to change the way that UNFICYP is financed so that the United Nations portion of the costs is funded through assessed contributions. This would place UNFICYP on the same financial footing as all the other United Nations peace-keeping operations.

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

We will continue to work towards that goal in the months to come, with the hope and expectation that the members of the Council will agree to finance UNFICYP through assessed contributions - hence by all States Members of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Canada for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. RICHARDSON (United Kingdom): I would like to begin by congratulating you warmly, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month and at the same time to thank your predecessor, Ambassador Tornudd, on the way he handled our work in what turned out to be an exceptionally busy month.

I can be very brief. I do not intend to enter into the political aspects of the Cyprus question, on which we await the Secretary-General's further report on his mission of good offices. My delegation has supported the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) for a further six months, but I must make clear that we fully share the concerns which have just been expressed by the representative of Canada about the growing deterioration in the financial situation facing the Force.

The statement made by our previous President on behalf of all of us around this table made it clear that peace-keeping operations must be launched and maintained on a sound and secure financial basis. UNFICYP is in a difficult and anomalous financial position and this, I have to say, is giving rise to growing concern. We need urgent steps to place the Force on a more solid financial footing. We therefore support fully the proposal that the Secretary-General has once again made in his report that the United Nations share of the cost of UNFICYP should be financed from assessed contributions.

We believe there is no alternative to this long overdue change. It would not only help reduce the inordinately heavy burden on troop-contributing countries; more important, I think, it would ensure UNFICYP's future and its contribution to

(Mr. Richardson, United Kingdom)

an eventual negotiated settlement and at the same time demonstrate that this Council is serious when it renews UNFICYP's mandate every six months. The problem is growing and it is not going to go away.

It is disappointing that the Council has not yet been able to reach agreement even to consider this important step; but in the mean time we fully endorse the Secretary-General's call on Member States to increase their voluntary contributions to UNFICYP and, it almost goes without saying, we warmly thank those that have already made such voluntary contributions.

We hope that all Member States will respond with generosity to the Secretary-General's appeal.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. TORNUDD (Finland) (interpretation from French): This is the first opportunity my delegation has had to greet you, Sir, at a formal meeting in your capacity as President, and I hasten to offer you my most sincere congratulations on the occasion of France's assumption of the presidency of the Council. We are well aware of the burden of your responsibilities and we offer you our best wishes and assurances to co-operate closely with the presidency in the constructive accomplishment of our common tasks.

Secondly, I take this opportunity to join in the words of welcome addressed to our new colleague, the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, Ambassador Li Daoyu, who has just taken his place at the Security Council table for the first time today.

As is well known, my country, Finland, is among those which for years have provided personnel and resources to the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). Together with other troop-contributing countries, we therefore share the concerns arising out of the long-standing serious financial crisis of the

(Mr. Tornudd, Finland)

United Nations Force in Cyprus. This situation is described in detail in the Secretary-General's report (S/21340) and in his letter dated 31 May 1990. Together with the other troop-contributing countries, Finland has on many occasions drawn the Council's attention to this regrettable situation. We believe that it is absolutely necessary to alleviate the heavy burden carried at present by troop-contributing countries by financing the United Nations portion of the cost through assessed contributions, as suggested by the Secretary-General in his report.

I also take this opportunity to stress that the presidential statement dated 30 May 1990 (S/21323) concerning the United Nations peace-keeping operations is, of course, fully applicable to the Force in Cyprus. We wish to note that peace-keeping operations are temporary measures intended to facilitate the settlement of differences and conflicts and that they should never be considered as taking the place of the ultimate goal, a negotiated settlement at the earliest possible date.

In the present case, it is incumbent upon us once again to ask the leaders of the two communities to redouble their efforts with a view to reaching a mutually acceptable settlement of the Cyprus problem.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Finland for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. VORONTSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Sir, I welcome your accession to the presidency of the Security Council and I feel sure that under your presidency we will be able, in the spirit of co-operation, to resolve any matters that are on the Council's agenda.

I should also like sincerely to thank the representative of Finland, who successfully discharged his work in dealing with the difficult problems facing the Council in May.

I am very happy to welcome the new representative of the People's Republic of China to the Security Council, Ambassador Li Daoyu. I feel sure that the Security Council has in him a strong supporter of co-operation and collaboration among all the members of the Council.

The position of the Soviet Union on the question of a settlement in Cyprus is well known to all. It is based upon our sincere desire to contribute specifically to bring the situation out of chronic deadlock and to solve the long-standing problems on the basis of resolutions adopted by the United Nations and taking into account the legitimate interests of the Cypriot people. Accordingly, the Soviet delegation supported the draft resolution on extending the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) for the next period.

The experience acquired so far in the settlement of conflict situations has shown that for success we need the political will of all the parties involved in the conflict, realism, patience and flexibility. Only in this way, on a reasonable and mutually acceptable basis, can it be possible to find a sound and viable solution to the Cyprus problem.

Let me recall that on 30 May the representative of Finland, as President of the Council, spoke on behalf of us all when he made his statement and said that peace-keeping operations must never replace the final objective, which is a swift settlement to the conflict through negotiations.

(Mr. Vorontsov, USSR)

We have followed carefully what has been done in the Secretary-General's mission of good offices, and we support the efforts of Mr. Peréz de Cuéllar in trying to get practical results through this dialogue. We noted with understanding the Secretary-General's intention, as indicated in his report on the peace-keeping force in Cyprus, to submit an additional report to the Council, his remarks on the resumption of the intensive talks and the preparation of an agreed framework for a comprehensive agreement in accordance with resolution 649 (1990).

Like other members of the Council, we trust that with the support of the United Nations the interested parties, in a spirit of responsibility, will begin the search for a solution to the problems that have accumulated.

We are firmly convinced that the Secretary-General's mission of good offices in the current difficult situation deserves now more than ever the strongest support of the members of the Security Council. At the same time, I cannot fail to note that giving priority to the financial problem, as has just been done here in the Council, simply distracts us from focusing on the specific serious issue of providing support to the Secretary-General as he discharges his mission.

While the Soviet Union recognizes that there are serious financial difficulties, it considers that the main reason is that the Cyprus problem has inadmissibly long remained unresolved. We believe that problems relating to financing the force in Cyprus can hardly be regarded in isolation from other crucial aspects of the United Nations peace-keeping operation in Cyprus.

We should not lose sight of the specific nature and characteristics of this particular United Nations peace-keeping operation, as reflected in Security Council resolution 186 (1964), which established the peace-keeping force in Cyprus. Let me recall that the Soviet Union supported that resolution at the time, taking into account the stance of Cyprus and the fact that the adoption of this resolution would not result in financial obligations being imposed on Member States not involved in the force.

(Mr. Vorontsov, USSR)

Accordingly, the problem of financing has to be resolved in accordance with the procedures laid down in that Security Council resolution. It is on that basis that we did not oppose the Secretary-General's appeal to Member States "for a voluntary financial contribution" so as "to enable UNFICYP to continue to carry out the functions for which it was established". I hope that countries that are in a position to do so will make a positive response to the Secretary-General's appeal.

The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that the understanding with regard to the financial procedures laid down in Security Council resolution 186 (1964), still holds good and will not be undermined.

The practice established by the decisions of the Council more than 25 years ago has, in our view, become binding and we should continue to follow it.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for his kind words addressed to me.

The Council will now hear statements from the parties. The first speaker on my list is the representative of Cyprus, on whom I now call.

Mr. MAVROMMATIS (Cyprus): At the outset, Sir, I wish to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of June. Your excellent diplomatic skills and experience assure that the Council will successfully discharge its important functions under the Charter and perform the current tasks before it. The Government of the Republic of Cyprus pledges its full support to you and to the Council in the performance of your high duties.

I should also like to congratulate the Permanent Representative of Finland, Ambassador Tornudd, for the exemplary manner in which he carried out his duties as President of the Council during the month of May, a difficult month indeed, during which important decisions had to be taken.

I believe that it is appropriate for me also to say how happy we are to see the new Permanent Representative of China, Mr. Li Daoyu, among us.

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

In expressing thanks and appreciation to the Council for resolution 657 (1990), which has just been adopted, renewing the mandate of the United Nations Peace-Keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) and that of the good offices mission of the Secretary-General, I wish to stress how indispensable these decisions are to the search for a solution to the question of Cyprus.

I should like to express my Government's deep appreciation to the States contributing troops and civilian police to UNFICYP and to those that have contributed to the financing of the Force. We have been following closely the question of the economic crisis that UNFICYP faces. We express the hope that the matter will soon be resolved and the troop-contributing countries will be relieved of the inordinate burden placed on them.

We wish to pay a tribute to Major General Clyde Milner, the Force Commander, and to his staff and personnel, for the manner in which they are carrying out this important peace-keeping function in Cyprus.

I should also like to pay a tribute to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Oscar Camilión, and to his colleagues, particularly Mr. Joachim Hutter, who has just joined us here in New York, with all of whom I have worked so closely in Cyprus for several years.

The Secretary-General's team on the Cyprus situation, and particularly Mr. Dayal, who has successfully completed certain tasks and is now being charged with additional ones, Mr. Carl-August Fleischhauer, Mr. Marrack Goulding, Mr. Picco and Mr. Feissel, who so ably assisted the Secretary-General during his current efforts, also deserve every praise.

The President of Cyprus, Mr. Vassiliou, the Government and the people of Cyprus, as well as the country's Permanent Representative to the United Nations would very much like, particularly on this occasion, to express deep appreciation for the role played by the Secretary-General himself. His grasp of the problem, his experience and diplomatic skills, and at the same time his patience,

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

perseverance and dedication, even in the face of adversity, challenges, rejections, or even denials of competence, make him eminently suitable for the important tasks that he has undertaken.

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

Although a further report is to be submitted later by the Secretary-General on his good-offices mission upon the completion of current consultations, yet I believe that the occasion calls for a reference to the reasons that necessitated such consultations.

Six months ago I had this to say on the efforts of the Secretary-General and the reasons that were delaying resumption of the dialogue and the discussion of a set of ideas presented by the Secretary-General to both sides in writing on 25 July 1989:

> "The second meeting, which was called in the hope of repairing the damage done during the first, was also unsuccessful in the sense, as we understand it, that the unacceptable conditions which cannot be discussed and are tantamount, inter alia, to recognition of the UDI and the right to separate self-determination and dismemberment of the Republic of Cyprus, are still there and if anything their priority of discussion was demanded".

I was referring to the two meetings of the Secretary-General that took place last October and November.

Further, on the negative response of Mr. Denktash to the Secretary-General's ideas, I said that Mr. Denktash's reaction was

> "to reject the agreed negotiating procedure and challenge openly the role of the Secretary-General."

When the date for the extended talks of last February was announced, everybody hoped against hope - and I say this because of a string of intransigent statements by Mr. Denktash and Turkish Government officials - that at long last they had heeded the call of the Security Council contained in the relevant statement of its then President and the friendly advice by several countries to Ankara, and that a real and extended dialogue was imminent.

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

The hopes of all of us were dashed when the whole effort and the dialogue that was to start on 26 February 1990 and to continue for about two weeks failed. In fact, Mr. Denktash never allowed it to resume. The Secretary-General had this to say in his report to the Security Council dated 8 March 1990:

> "Further, I recalled that, in the course of the discussion, Mr. Denktas had stated that the term 'communities' be used in a manner that was synonymous with the term 'peoples', each having a separate right to 'self-determination'." -

I could almost say, "O tempora! O mores!"-

> "Mr. Denktash also proposed certain other terms for the word 'communities'. I stated that, in the context of the intercommunal talks, the introduction of terminology that was different from that used by the Security Council had thus posed more than a semantic problem and that, unless acceptable to both sides, any change in terminology could alter the conceptual framework to which all had thus far adhered. In the circumstances, I came to the conclusion, regrettably, that we faced an impasse of a substantive kind, which raised questions regarding the essence of the mandate of good offices given to me by the Security Council and, therefore, regarding the basis of the talks." (S/21183, para. 15)

By then, every Government and every representative in the United Nations knew that Turkey and Mr. Denktash were wholly and exclusively responsible for the failure, by undermining and denying the role of the Secretary-General, including his right to make suggestions and by rejecting his ideas as well as the agreed negotiating procedure and the very foundation of the dialogue, and by introducing new unacceptable demands and preconditions such as that of being a people and having the right to separate self-determination contrary to international law, the Charter and its purposes and principles, the Security Council resolutions on Cyprus and the agreed basis for the talks.

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

The full picture of what actually transpired is described in the aforesaid report of the Secretary-General, and the appropriate remedy to revert to legality can be found in the first operative paragraph of resolution 649 (1990), unanimously adopted by the Security Council, which not only reaffirmed all previous resolutions on Cyprus but also reiterated the exclusion of union in whole or in part with any other country and any form of partition or secession, thus reiterating and reaffirming Security Council resolutions 541 (1983) and 550 (1984), which declare the Turkish Cypriot UDI illegal and call for its withdrawal.

The decision of the Security Council with regard to separate self-determination has had no effect on Mr. Denktash, who continues in a series of public statements - the last of which was made a few short days ago - to insist on these preconditions, which calls for further stern action by the Security Council.

This kind of attitude is also evident in the illegal arrest, detention and sentencing to gaol terms by the illegal régime of five Greek Cypriot youths who on different occasions crossed the demilitarized zone and were accused of violating the non-existent borders of a non-existent State, which nevertheless Turkey sees fit to promote and encourage at every opportunity.

But the responsibility of Turkey is not limited to aiding and abetting Turkish-Cypriot intransigence and the wrecking of the Secretary-General's efforts to find a just solution to the Cyprus problem. Turkey's greatest and unforgiveable general responsibility for the continuation of the tragedy of Cyprus is to be found mainly in the following:

First, the illegal presence of a huge occupation army in Cyprus, there to promote and perpetuate the division of a State Member of the United Nations and every other illegality connected therewith;

Secondly, the continuing - despite United Nations decisions - violation of basic human rights and fundamental freedoms, failing to assist the work of the

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

Committee on Missing Persons to arrive at acceptable decisions and also failing to implement Security Council resolution 550 (1983), which is of course mandatory and which, inter alia, considers attempts to settle any part of Varosha by people other than its inhabitants as inadmissible;

Thirdly, the continuing implantation of thousands of settlers from Turkey whose presence is contrary to both international and domestic law and has reached the staggering number of over 80,000, compared with a Turkish Cypriot population of approximately 90,000, with the following repercussions or objectives, by the perpetrators:

First, to change the demographic character of Cyprus by radically altering the tradition ratio of 80 per cent Greek Cypriots to 18 per cent Turkish Cypriots in an attempt to justify the exaggerated and unfounded claims of the Turkish side with regard to the territorial arrangements and political power in Cyprus;

Second, to neutralize or distort the political volition of the Turkish Cypriots by rendering them a minority in the occupied area of Cyprus after the massive influx of colonist settlers, who are already holding the balance of power through the establishment of a political party with exclusive Turkish settler membership, which ensures that the decisions of the Turkish Cypriot leadership are in line with the dictates of Ankara;

Third, to provide a substantial source of additional trained military reserves in Cyprus, augmenting the considerable presence of the Turkish Cypriot occupation forces;

Fourth, to add an additional complicating factor, aggravating further the search for a just and viable solution to the Cyprus problem;

Fifth, knowing the importance of demographic changes both universally - as we have seen quite clearly recently in the Middle East - and particularly in the case of Cyprus, which has entrenched constitutional provisions regulating the number of

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

people of Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot origin that may legally return and settle in Cyprus, and doing so in order to make a just solution impossible, a clear indication that Turkey only pays lip service to the search for such a solution, while promoting the partition of Cyprus;

Finally, in the long-term for the combined Turkish Cypriot and settler population to reach parity with, and even to outnumber, the Greek Cypriots in line with the declared expansionist plans of Turkey against Cyprus - and we have had recent similar cases involving Turkey.

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

Cyprus, although always trying, to the greatest extent consistent with its soverign rights, not to do anything that could give Turkey any pretext to avoid or delay the negotiating process, has to warn that events we have just described in connection with the settlers have by far overtaken the limits of its patience and that it is now bound to take appropriate action. This could entail seeking, at the appropriate time, the further involvement of the Security Council.

Turkey's unwillingness to demonstrate even the slightest sign of self-restraint is evident also in the unacceptable practice of the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations, repeated many times, of requesting circulation and having circulated as United Nations documents letters and statements emanating from and expressing the views of the pseudo-State which was strongly and unequivocally condemned by Security Council resolutions 541 (1983) and 550 (1984). Those acts show contempt for the Security Council, which has condemned that illegal entity and which asked all States not to recognize it; at the same time they are abusive and insulting towards both the Secretary-General and the Security Council.

The Security Council, which has recently been more active and successful in co-operation with the Secretary-General, cannot in the case of Cyprus limit itself to the renewal of mandates and the occasional presidential statement. It has to demand from Turkey more respect for its resolutions and the Charter's principles, the abandonment of illegal pre-conditions and, most important, tangible proof of the existence of the political will to embark on a meaningful dialogue.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Cyprus for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Greece, on whom I now call.

Mr. ZEPOS (Greece) (interpretation from French): It gives me great pleasure, Sir, to congratulate you most sincerely on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of June. We are certain that your experience and well-known diplomatic skill will ensure smooth proceedings in the Council. I wish also to reaffirm that historic ties of history, culture, friendship and a devotion to human values are a constant element in the relations between my country and France; among these, a commitment to building Europe is of special importance.

I take this opportunity to thank your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Finland, for the outstanding way in which he presided over the Council's work in May, both in New York and in Geneva.

I wish also to take this opportunity warmly to welcome the new Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China, Ambassador Li Daoyu, who is participating in his first meeting of the Security Council today.

In addition, I wish on behalf of the Government of Greece to extend sincere congratulations to the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Yemen on the unification of his country.

I cannot fail to express my Government's sincere thanks and appreciation to the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, for his perseverance and dedication in the face of the difficult obstacles he encounters as he carries out his mission of good offices. Our thanks go also to his Special Representative in Cyprus, Mr. Camilión, and to all the close colleagues of the Secretary-General who deal with the question of Cyprus.

Once again the question of Cyprus has reached a critical turning-point. It has been three months since the Council's unanimous adoption of resolution 649 (1990), after witnessing the complete collapse of the most recent efforts of the Secretary-General, who had sought to breathe new life into the intercommunal

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

talks. The Council will recall that the President of the Republic of Cyprus and the head of the Turkish Cypriot community had accepted the Secretary-General's invitation to begin extended talks here in New York on 26 February to prepare the outlines of an overall agreement.

The reasons for the failure of those talks are well known, having been set out clearly in the report of the Secretary-General of 8 March 1990, which was available to all Member States as an official document of the Security Council (S/21183). We share the disappointment of the Secretary-General who concluded with regret that he was faced with a deadlock on a substantive problem; this raised questions about the very nature of his mission of good offices and thus called into question the very foundation of the talks. We all know that the Secretary-General's conclusion on the existence of a substantive problem resulted from the insistence by the head of the Turkish Cypriot community on the notion of a separate people in Cyprus and on promoting the idea of a new entity which the Security Council, in its resolutions 367 (1975), 541 (1983) and 550 (1984), had regarded as non-existent and had even explicitly condemned. I would also recall the recent resolution 649 (1990) which inter alia formally excluded any form of partition or secession in the case of Cyprus.

We must give special attention to the two latest reports of the Secretary-General, those of 8 March 1990 and 31 May 1990. That is not only because we are grateful for his efforts to bring together the conditions necessary for a substantive dialogue. We must conclude yet again that his efforts cannot succeed without a clear vision of the scope and nature of the crisis, which the United Nations cannot resolve without fixing responsibility for it. The reports of the Secretary-General help us determine the nature of the crisis, which we believe is political, institutional and financial, and in establishing once and for all where the responsibility lies.

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

We must acknowledge the political nature of the deadlock which the Secretary-General has brought to our attention. The Secretary-General informs us that, by the terms of the Security Council resolutions and the high-level agreements concluded in 1977 and 1979, his mission of good offices has been challenged by one of the two interlocutors. During the recent talks, the head of the Turkish Cypriot community attempted to introduce criteria which were not merely a question of semantics or terminology but a matter of substance; in that way he opposed the unity, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus, of which the Security Council is a guarantor. Aspirations with no legal basis were put forward. The Secretary-General, whose conclusions were not limited to the causes of the collapse of the recent talks, formally and unequivocally stated who was responsible for it. It was Mr. Denktash, who, as we all know, relying on the Turkish army of occupation, not only disregards United Nations resolutions reaffirming the unity, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus, but also makes no commitment to respect the high-level agreements of which he is a signatory.

There is often talk about re-establishing trust between the two communities, and it seems that there have been some contacts and other initiatives in that area, despite the problems and obstacles introduced by the head of the Turkish Cypriot community.

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

At meetings held through the hospitality of the Secretary-General the President of the Republic of Cyprus, Mr. Vassiliou, has availed himself of the opportunity to inform members of the Council on the extent of his own efforts. I myself would like to emphasize the importance of an apparently simple de facto situation that has not, perhaps, been sufficiently grasped in recent years. That is, that the authorities of the Republic of Cyprus are providing the occupied northern part of the country with all the electricity it requires for its energy needs without any reimbursement. Other social and humanitarian services are still being provided to the northern part of the country by the Republic. Some circles have remarked that, in spite of Turkey's invasion and occupation, the southern part of the country has managed to give proof of some economic dynamism and a certain affluence, as though the consequences of the invasion had not been devastating and tragic enough to prevent the Cypriots from re-establishing their economy to some degree. Let me say that such remarks reflect a certain cynicism and ignorance of the confidence-building measures undertaken by the Republic vis-à-vis the Turkish Cypriot community.

The crisis affects the United Nations system and, more directly, the Security Council, given the fact that Turkey has seen fit to reject the Council's resolutions, as it has just done with the resolution just adopted for renewal of the Force. For our part, it is with regret - but also with some astonishment - that we note that an attempt has been made to go along with Turkey's logic in respect to its conduct towards the United Nations. As an example I might mention that in the guise of letters addressed to the Secretary-General my Turkish colleague has been having circulated texts written by an individual on his own personal behalf that contain offensive and pretentious language against the European Parliament, one of the three major bodies of the European Community that

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

Turkey wishes to join or with which it hopes to enjoy special ties. I refer to Security Council document S/21212, which, in our opinion, constitutes an abuse of United Nations privilege.

On a more important and serious level we feel in duty bound to emphasize that the institutional aspect of the crisis is brought out by the fact that the Security Council is unable to react more effectively to the presence in Cyprus of 35,000 Turkish occupying troops. Although we regret that after more than 25 years since the establishment of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) it has still not been possible to arrive at a negotiated settlement to the problem - as resolution 649 (1990) notes - there is clearly even greater reason for us to regret that 16 years have elapsed since the flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter and that the scourge of war still afflicts this European country. Cyprus may soon be the only country that shares the fate of the occupied territories of the Middle East. It is quite clear that for the prime reason of military occupation I have mentioned, as well as because of Turkey's interference in the intracommunal talks, evidenced, inter alia, by repeated press releases setting forth the same views that have led the talks into an impasse, the Council should implement paragraph 5 of resolution 649 (1990) and call upon it to refrain from any action that could aggravate the situation.

We expect Turkey to make a gesture of goodwill and to go along with an agreed solution to the problem of Cyprus by peaceful means within the framework of the mission of good offices of the Secretary-General, in keeping with the rules governing United Nations bodies.

I should like to add a few words on the financial aspects of the crisis, given the $179 million deficit in the Force's budget. Greece has long maintained that the Force should be financed through assessed contributions. My Government greatly

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

appreciates the effort and sacrifices made by contributing countries and we continue to maintain that the system for financing the Force in Cyprus should be the same as that employed for other United Nations peace-keeping forces. I should like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to Force Commander Clive Milner for the manner in which he has been carrying out his delicate mission, as well as to the Force's military and civilian personnel for the devotion they have demonstrated in the performance of their duties.

The United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus enhances the feeling of security necessary to all the Island's inhabitants so long as the situation created by the presence of occupying forces and settlers, both from Turkey, continues to prevail. As it is well known, the latter are arbitrarily settling in occupied territory. As the Secretary-General indicates in his recent report of 31 May, the Force has not been able to extend its freedom of movement in the northern part of the Island. In that occupied part of the territory the Force might eventually have been able - and I am citing a personal example - to investigate the scope of the demographic change created by the ever-growing wave of settlers, who are, upon their arrival, provided by the Turkish authorities with land abandoned by the Greek Cypriot refugees, a land provision that includes the right to vote. The vicious and despotic circle is thus complete. Faced with these many high-handed actions being taken in the north of Cyprus, the Security Council is called upon to resolve the crisis in each of the three aspects I have just described.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Greece for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is Mr. Ozer Koray, to whom the Council has extended an invitation in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. KOPAY: I would like to thank you, Mr. President, and, through you, the other members of the Security Council, for giving me this opportunity to address the Council on the subject of the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) for a further period of six months. I would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of June. My congratulations also go to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Finland, for the skilful manner in which he conducted the Council's work during the month of May.

(Mr. Koray)

You will recall, Sir, that President Rauf Denktas and Greek Cypriot leader Mr. George Vassiliou met in New York between 26 February and 2 March this year upon the invitation of the Secretary-General. Although the proposed aim of the meeting was to prepare a draft outline, the essential groundwork for that purpose had not been done during the previous months.

At the time, the talks, as you know, had been stalled due to the pre-conditions set and the intransigent attitude displayed by the Greek Cypriot leader. I will not go into the details of those spoiling tactics by the Greek Cypriot side, which pushed the negotiating process into deadlock. The Turkish Cypriot side, in an effort to break out of the impasse, made substantive proposals on more than one occasion, so that the negotiations could be meaningfully pursued. In this spirit, the Turkish Cypriot side also proposed the signing of a joint declaration of the two sides pledging to work towards a settlement under conditions of peaceful co-existence, friendship and respect for each other's rights. In all those cases the Greek Cypriot leader turned his back and refused even to look at our various proposals.

In view of that, the Turkish Cypriot side, before coming to New York in February, requested that certain fundamental issues and concepts be clarified with Mr. Vassiliou. President Denktas indicated that without preparatory groundwork in Cyprus to cover all issues and to reconcile the existing divergence of views between the two sides it would be futile to expect any positive outcome from the New York meetings. Obviously, Mr. Vassiliou had no intention of changing his position, and, worse still, came to New York totally unprepared, with nothing constructive to put on the table that would make a contribution to the process.

The Turkish Cypriot side, on the other hand, came to New York in good faith, fully aware of the difficulties that had to be countered, and produced written proposals on all aspects of a settlement. Mr. Vassiliou once again pushed aside

(Mr. Koray)

our substantive and procedural proposals, and instead engaged in empty rhetoric that steered the talks away from its target; at the same time he brought into the open the disagreement on fundamental concepts and principles.

President Denktas was proved right on 2 March this year, when it became apparent that Mr. Vassiliou had not come to New York to negotiate a settlement based on federation with the equal political status and participation of the two peoples in exercise of their separate right freely to decide their future political status. Mr. Vassiliou had come to New York to prevent precisely that outcome, and for that purpose he managed to stall the negotiations.

Unfortunately, an agreement has once again eluded us, due to the rigid position adopted by the Greek Cypriot leader throughout the New York summit meeting. Since the breakdown of the talks the Greek Cypriot side has stepped up not only its campaign of vilification in international forums, but at the same time its actions and policies that serve only to increase tension in the island. We hope that the Greek Cypriots will not destroy all vestiges of trust between the two peoples, and will decide to resume serious negotiations with the Turkish Cypriot side.

It should be underlined here that for the two sides to be able to move towards a federal solution the two political entities should, first, establish their relationship on a new pattern based on respect for each other's existence, integrity and political equality. In this context, the separate right of the two peoples to decide freely their future political status - that is, the right to self-determination - is an essential element of a negotiated settlement based on federation.

The Turkish Cypriot people would like to see a federal settlement with the Greek Cypriots, based on genuine equality, power-sharing and bi-zonality. They would like to see an agreement entailing full and effective guarantees for

(Mr. Koray)

their security and national existence. They would like to see their basic and inalienable rights as a separate people recognized, respected and preserved.

President Denktas, on behalf of his people, has resolutely defended those rights and principles. He has negotiated with the Greek Cypriot side, with a clear mandate from the Turkish Cypriot Parliament, representing the free will of the Turkish Cypriot people. His negotiating position has reflected, not personal ambitions, as alleged by the Greek Cypriot side, but the legitimate concerns and aspirations of his people. The Turkish Cypriot people renewed their full support for President Denktas by overwhelmingly re-electing him President of the Republic on 22 April this year. In that election President Denktas received over two thirds of the votes cast, which should prove to everyone that he pursues a course that is fully backed by his people.

After the summit meeting between the two sides, the Secretary-General on 8 March submitted his report (S/21183), informing the Security Council of the results of the meeting and giving his assessment of the situation.

The Secretary-General has emphasized certain points of major significance in the context of the Cyprus negotiations and the relationship between the two peoples in the island. I shall very briefly recall those crucial points, which were clearly spelled out in the Secretary-General's report. The Secretary-General made it clear that the relationship between the two parties was not one of majority and minority. He also underlined that the participation of the two sides in the process was on an equal footing and that the solution being sought was one that must be decided upon by, and must be acceptable to, both peoples.

Equally important, the Secretary-General called for acknowledgement of the political equality of the two peoples in the federation, which is to be bi-communal as well as bi-zonal in nature.

The objective of the mission of good offices, the Secretary-General explained,

(Mr. Koray)

was a new constitution for Cyprus that would regulate relations between the two sides on a federal, bi-communal and bi-zonal basis. The federal arrangement would have to ensure the effective participation of the two sides.

It is no mere coincidence that all our proposals put forward throughout the process of negotiations - which, regrettably, have received no positive response from the Greek Cypriot side - have reflected the very principles and concepts highlighted by the Secretary-General in his report. We have tried to get our points across to the Greek Cypriot side, but it has not been possible to make any progress in the face of the rejectionist stand of the Greek Cypriot side.

Having considered the Secretary-General's report, the Security Council adopted resolution 649 (1990) on 12 March 1990. By that resolution, the Security Council called for negotiations between the two sides, on an equal footing, in order to reach freely a mutually acceptable settlement, which would be a bi-communal, bi-zonal federation. The Council confirmed the legal and political equality of the Turkish Cypriots and the Greek Cypriots. The Council also called upon the two sides in Cyprus to refrain from hostile actions that would aggravate the situation.

The Secretary-General's report and the Council's resolution have set out important ground rules for the process of negotiations and the conduct of relations between the two sides in Cyprus. In the light of resolution 649 (1990) we expect all Governments and international institutions to treat the two sides in Cyprus equally. The Greek Cypriots can no longer be treated as the Government of Cyprus, as there is no single authority in Cyprus capable of representing, and based on the consent of, both sides.

(Mr. Koray)

The Greek Cypriots have no authority in law, or in fact, to represent Cyprus as a whole. As long as they are not urged to come to terms with this reality the Greek Cypriots will never be inclined to negotiate on a realistic basis with the Turkish Cypriots as stipulated by resolution 649 (1990). Therefore, it is important for third parties to treat the Greek Cypriot administration and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus equally and fairly, in accordance with the provisions of that resolution

The road to a new political partnership in Cyprus will only pass through the creation, in the first instance, of a climate of confidence and good relations between the two peoples. Nobody can expect a political association to be viable if the constituent parties continue to regard each other as adversaries. That is why the Turkish Cypriot side firmly believes that the two States should first make peace with each other and initiate a new pattern of relationship before attempting to move towards a genuine federation. In this respect, it is a prerequisite that the two sides should refrain from any action which creates tension and mistrust in the island. Operative paragraph 5 of Security Council resolution 649 (1990) has in fact called upon the two sides to refrain from such actions. Despite this important prerequisite, and the Council's clear call, it is disheartening to see that the Greek Cypriot administration is still pursuing a policy of hostility against the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus both in South Cyprus and abroad.

A most serious violation of paragraph 5 of resolution 649 (1990) is the continued stockpiling of sophisticated assault weapons and other military equipment by the Greek Cypriot administration. While Mr. Vassiliou's Defence Minister is busily concluding agreements for new arms purchases in various countries, Greek Cypriot military and political leaders are boasting about the growing military power of South Cyprus and making provocative statements, some of them tantamount to a declaration of war against the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. Details of

(Mr. Koray)

Greek Cypriot military preparations, aggressive actions and hostile statements over the recent years can be found in our numerous letters addressed to the Secretary-General which have been circulated as United Nations documents. Suffice it to say here that the increase of manpower and the excessive concentration of weaponry in South Cyprus work against a peaceful settlement between the two states in Cyprus.

The Greek Cypriot administration, in close co-ordination with Greece, has also stepped up its longstanding world-wide propaganda campaign against the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. According to recent reports, the Greek Cypriot National Council is considering an "Action Plan" masterminded by the Greek Cypriot Foreign Minister to drag the Cyprus issue to various international forums with a view to extracting one-sided resolutions and intensifying their defamatory policies against the Turkish Cypriot people. In line with this new plan, the Greek Cypriot administration is aggressively exploiting the Cyprus issue at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe, and is actively engaged in efforts to bring this issue to the European Court of Justice, the Human Rights Committee of the Council of Europe, and other bodies. The Greek Cypriot administration and Greece have set up a joint committee to oversee and co-ordinate propaganda efforts in the international arena.

The Greek Cypriots should know that this massive internationalization campaign is totally imcompatible with the process of negotiations. Serious talks cannot be expected to endure without an improved atmosphere. The ongoing Greek Cypriot embargo against the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus in all spheres, the Greek Cypriot rearmament campaign and other hostile activities should be terminated if there is a genuine wish on the part of the Greek Cypriots to foster the climate in which negotiations can be resumed.

(Mr. Koray)

All these developments show that the Greek Cypriot side has effectively abandoned the negotiating process. The Greek Cypriot plan of action is a renewed effort to present the Cyprus issue as a minority-majority problem. It is an attempt to negate the equal political status of the Turkish Cypriots in any future settlement. It is an effort to deceive the world into believing that they are not to blame for the lack of progress in the negotiations. In short, they are trying to involve third parties and international institutions to perpetuate the 27-year-old injustice committed against the Turkish Cypriot people.

Another issue which forms an integral part of the above-mentioned Greek Cypriot Action Plan is the intended unilateral application for membership of the European Community which would perpetuate the present state of affairs on the island. In this regard, I would like to point out that in the event of an application for membership, without the participation and consent of the Turkish Cypriot side, the Greek Cypriot administration will deal a fatal blow to the negotiations. To take a step that would fundamentally alter the future of Cyprus without reference to the Turkish Cypriot side would be tantamount to rejecting any kind of partnership with the Turkish Cypriots. The Greek Cypriot administration has already done enough to exploit the European Community-Cyprus Association Agreement to manipulate European Community-Cyprus relations to the detriment of the Turkish Cypriots. The proposed application for Community membership would provide them with a new weapon for further tightening the ongoing economic embargo against the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. They are currently sparing no effort to stop Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus exports to European Community markets.

Since the coming to power of Mr. Vassiliou in February of 1988, demonstrations and other border incidents have increased considerably. On many occasions aggressive Greek Cypriot demonstrators have attempted to make illegal entries into our territory. There have been times when it was not possible for UNFICYP to

(Mr. Koray)

contain the violence in and around the buffer zone, which culminated in the violation of our borders and the forcible entry into the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus by the aggressors. Some of these demonstrators were arrested by the Turkish Cypriot Police and tried in Turkish Cypriot Courts for illegal entry through our borders. More recently, several Greek Cypriot youths, who had managed to enter into the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus clandestinely, were arrested by the Turkish Cypriot Police while attempting to bring down the Turkish Cypriot flag. They were charged, tried and sentenced by our courts.

The fact that the aggressors have been applauded and praised by the Greek Cypriot leadership for their illegal actions and declared "heroes" and "pioneers" for the "liberation" of Cyprus, demonstrates that the Greek Cypriot side is not interested in maintaining peace and tranquility in the island. On the contrary, it is encouraging dangerous actions in order to undermine the existence of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, through every possible means, and pursuing a policy of intimidation and provocation against the Turkish Cypriot people.

Such Greek Cypriot policies are not compatible with the negotiating process and the efforts for a peaceful settlement in Cyprus.

In Cyprus, there are two sovereign States and peoples. The Greek Cypriots have no jurisdiction or control over the Turkish Cypriot people or their territory. They have no constitutional right to claim sovereignty over the island as a whole, and cannot represent the "Republic of Cyprus", which was destroyed in 1963 by Greek Cypriot armed aggression. The objective of the negotiating exercise under the auspices of the United Nations Secretary-General is to reach a new political settlement based on a new constitution. If the Greek Cypriot claim to sovereignty and legality were tenable, then there would be no need for a new settlement or for a new constitution defining the relationship between the two peoples. We hope that, from now on, third parties will encourage the Greek Cypriot

(Mr. Koray)

side to accept the realities of Cyprus, and thus facilitate an early settlement, which would provide for the establishment of a bi-zonal, bi-national federal State in which the constituent republics will enjoy equality in power-sharing and participation. In this respect we also hope that the Greek Cypriot side will create the necessary conditions in which the two sides can initiate a new process for the preparation of the groundwork as an essential basis for result-oriented negotiations in the future.

(Mr. Koray)

Turning now to the question of the extension of the mandate of UNFICYP, I would like to reiterate that the resolution which has just been adopted by the Security Council is unacceptable to the Turkish Cypriot side for the reasons that were outlined in previous Security Council debates on this matter. Any resolution which refers to the Greek Cypriot administration as the "Government of Cyprus" is unacceptable to the Turkish Cypriot side because such resolutions ignore the existing realities in Cyprus and attempt to negate the principle of equality between the two sides.

Notwithstanding its rejection of the present resolution, for the reasons outlined above, the Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is nevertheless favourably disposed to accept the presence of UNFICYP on the territory of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus on the same basis as that stated in December 1989. Thus, our position continues to be that the principle, the scope, the modalities and procedures of co-operation between the authorities of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and UNFICYP shall be based only on decisions which shall be taken solely by the Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

In this connection, I should like to recall the statement of the President of the Security Council, delivered on behalf of Council members on 30 May 1990 on the subject of United Nations peace-keeping operations, in which he stated, inter alia, that:

"They [the members of the Security Council] stress that a peace-keeping operation is essentially a temporary measure, intended to facilitate the resolution of conflicts and disputes. Its mandate is not automatically renewable. Peace-keeping should never be construed as a substitute for the

(Mr. Koray)

ultimate goal, an early negotiated settlement. In the light of this, the members of the Council will continue to examine carefully the mandate of each operation and, when necessary, vary it in response to prevailing circumstances." (S/21323, p. 2)

At this juncture, we have to stress that the present mandate of UNFICYP is not compatible with the radically changed conditions and circumstances of today. In the light of the present realities in Cyprus and the new approach spelled out in Security Council resolution 649 (1990), we believe that a reappraisal of UNFICYP's mandate is necessary. This would not only be in response to prevailing circumstances but also in keeping with the decision to reach a settlement that would be based on the equality of the two parties.

Before concluding my statement, I wish to reiterate my Government's support for the mission of good offices of the United Nations Secretary-General and the current efforts expended under his valuable auspices in finding a negotiated settlement in Cyprus. We assure him, once again, of our full co-operation in this regard. Likewise, we commend the efforts and invaluable contributions of the Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General in Cyprus, Mr. Oscar Camilión, and of Director Gustave Feissel, Mr. Daval and Mr. Picco. Finally, we commend the untiring efforts of the Commander of UNFICYP, Major General Clive Milner in the conduct of his important functions on the island.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank Mr. Koray for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Turkey, on whom I now call.

Mr. AKSIN (Turkey): Allow me to extend to you, Sir, the warm congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. We are confident that under your firm and able guidance the

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

Council will continue to carry out effectively its vital task of serving world peace.

I would also like to pay homage to the outgoing President, Ambassador Tornudd of Finland, for the diplomatic skills he displayed during the difficult negotiations that took place when he was presiding over the Council in May.

I wish also to take this opportunity to welcome Ambassador Li Daoyu of China to New York and to the United Nations.

The Security Council has just adopted a resolution extending the mandate of UNFICYP for a further six months. We cannot accept this resolution because of the language it contains. The representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus has just explained the objections of his Government to this resolution and my Government supports this position.

It will be recalled that the Government of Cyprus was formed in 1960 when Cyprus became independent. The constitution of Cyprus provided for the participation of the two national communities of Cyprus in the central government, the legislature, the judiciary and the public service. This constitution lasted until 1963, when the Greek Cypriots took over the administration by force of arms as a prelude to annexing the island to Greece. Since then, there has been no properly constituted "Government of Cyprus" and Turkey will not agree to attaching this label to the Greek Cypriot administration that exercises power in the southern part of the island.

A legal "Government of Cyprus" can only come about when the two political entities of the island, the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and its Greek Cypriot counterpart in the South, reach a settlement through direct talks between the two Cypriot leaders under the auspices of the Secretary-General's mission of good offices.

My Government was directly involved in the creation of the independent State

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

of Cyprus and was instrumental in preserving its independence during the turbulent years that followed the breakdown of constitutional order in 1963. Consequently, Turkey wishes to see an early resumption of the talks between President Denktash and Mr. Vassiliou which it regards as the only practical way for reaching a settlement that would conform to the guidelines restated in resolution 649 (1990), adopted unanimously by this Council on 14 March 1990.

This resolution calls upon the leaders to pursue their efforts to reach freely a mutually acceptable solution providing for the establishment of a bi-communal and bi-zonal federation. The resolution stresses the equality of the two political entities, and rightly so. To be viable, federations have to be freely established between equals. They must be based on existing realities and not on legal fictions. Hence our objection to one of the Cypriot parties claiming the title of "Government of Cyprus". Such a "Government of Cyprus" will eventually emerge from a settlement in Cyprus, but this label can in no way be used to designate the Government of either one of the existing two states in the island.

Another provision of resolution 649 (1990) that I wish to underline is operative paragraph 5, which calls on the parties to refrain from action that could aggravate the situation.

My Government is deeply disappointed at the way the Greek Cypriots have been violating this key provision. The representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus has been providing ample information about the actions of the Greek Cypriots in violation of operative paragraph 5, and I will not go into the details once again. I would like, however, to make clear that as long as the Greek Cypriots continue to wage relentless political and economic warfare against the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, they will never convince anyone of their sincerity when they sit at the negotiating table for the purpose of establishing a federation of equals in Cyprus. At a time when the Berlin Wall has come tumbling

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

down and old barriers are being swept aside everywhere, how can the Greek Cypriots justify their renewed attempts, with the assistance of Greece, to stop the modest exports of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus to the European Community? How do they justify their attempt to prevent an institution of higher education in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus from hooking up with a European computer network whose aim is to assist academic research? The Greek Cypriots must review their policy of military build-up, their slanderous campaign of propaganda, their various blockades and embargoes and ask themselves if these actions are making a settlement based on federation more likely. Are such methods as the attempt to internationalize the question of Cyprus through agitation, the creation of artificial tension on the island and the use of all forums for attacking the Turkish Cypriots making it easier for the Secretary-General to carry out his mission of good offices?

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

At a time when historical barriers are coming down in Europe and southern Africa, the Greek Cypriots should ask themselves whether the time has not come to have a change of heart. To live up to paragraph 5 of resolution 649 (1990) would be a good start. They could also take another look at President Denktas' proposal for the two leaders to sign a joint declaration which in essence is a code of conduct for the two parties to abide by in their dealings with one another. If the Greek Cypriots could bring themselves to negotiating and signing such a declaration it would be a psychological breakthrough in the efforts to end the 26-year-old division of Cyprus.

The Greek Cypriot attempt to portray the Turkish Cypriot leadership as being out of step with its own people has received a rude blow as a result of the presidential and parliamentary elections that took place in the north in recent weeks. President Denktas has emerged as a clear winner with the support of the overwhelming majority of his people. The Government of Prime Minister Eroglu will be backed by a solid majority in the Legislative Assembly of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. Turkey is glad to support the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and its leadership in their attempts to reach a fair and just solution. The Turkish Cypriots have been the victims of the terrible events that took place on the island in recent years. As the weaker party they are vulnerable and they also feel threatened. They have absolutely no claims on their Greek Cypriot neighbours. All they want is to be left alone to proceed with their economic and social development within their democratic society. They have indicated their readiness to reach a settlement with the Greek Cypriots on the basis of the parameters of resolution 649 (1990) and have made concrete proposals to this end. It is for all these reasons that they have Turkey's full support. They also deserve more backing and greater understanding from all peace-loving members of the international community that want a just and lasting settlement in Cyprus.

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

Before concluding, my elegation wants to place on record our continuing confidence in the Secretary-General in the performance of his good offices mission. We trust his sense of fair play and rely on his profound knowledge of the underlying causes of the question of Cyprus. He enjoys our full support as he works towards a resumption of the stalled talks. I wish also to salute Mr. Oscar Camilión who has worked diligently and patiently to overcome the barriers of mistrust to bring the two sides closer. In this he has been able to count on Director Feissel's valuable assistance and we thank him too. Finally, I wish to pay a tribute to UNFICYP, and particularly its Commander, Major General Milner, who has carried out his difficult duties with impartiality and high professional competence.

I had intended to conclude my statement at this point. However, in the course of the debate, the phony issue of the so-called Turkish settlers was raised once again, and I am compelled to refute what has been said on the subject.

In his report to the Security Council, dated 8 March 1990, document S/21183, the Secretary-General states that Cyprus is the common home of the Greek Cypriot community and of the Turkish Cypriot community and that their relationship is not one of majority and minority. The Government of Turkey subscribes to this view of the Secretary-General and considers the respective sizes of the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot populations of the island as being irrelevant to the final settlement to be worked out by the two parties. Based on this position, Turkey has no reason to attempt to alter the present demographic balance in Cyprus. As the Secretary-General has indicated in his report, the two parties in Cyprus are equal regardless of their size.

Turkey has never had a policy of encouraging its citizens to emigrate. Those of its citizens who leave to settle in other countries do so by their own free will. If Turkey had had a policy of altering the demographic balance of Cyprus,

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

Turkey could completely reverse the present ratio of Greek Cypriots to Turkish Cypriots on the island. Let it not be forgotten that Turkey's yearly increase in population is roughly double the size of the total population of Cyprus, Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots combined.

The Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus has its own immigration policies which correspond to the requirements of its economy for manpower. I presume the Greek Cypriots must also have their own legislation on this subject. Just as the Turkish Cypriots do not tell the Greek Cypriots whom they are to admit into, and whom they are to deport from, their country, neither can the Greek Cypriots tell the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus what that country's immigration policies will be.

I noticed also that in the course of the debate reference was made to human rights. On the question of human rights I should like to say the following: the worst human rights abuses in Cyprus took place when the Turkish Cypriots were living under colonial subjugation at the hands of the Greek Cypriots. For 11 years, between 1963 and 1974, they were treated as second-class citizens. They lived huddled in enclaves, refugees in their own country. Their freedom of travel was severely restricted. They were frequently denied water, electricity and fuel. Occasionally, gunmen went on a rampage in a Turkish Cypriot village or in the Turkish quarter of a town and scores of people were killed and maimed. The perpetrators of these deeds now have the effrontery to pretend that they have human rights concerns. They have the gall to refer to the territory of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, where the citizens of that country live in freedom, as the "occupied territories". I think they should be reminded that the age of colonialism is gone and it will never come back to Cyprus or anywhere else in the world.

Those members of the Council who want to know the true situation with regard to human rights in Cyprus can refer to the publication of the United States

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

Department of State which I have here. It is the latest issue of the Country Reports on Human Rights Practices and I will quote directly from page 1066 of this publication:

"The internal political system of the Republic of Cyprus and the Turkish Cypriot Administration are democratic and based on free elections, and they guarantee basic human rights to their populations in both theory and practice."

We do not agree with the labels that have been attached to the two political entities, but we certainly agree that the statement itself is unassailable.

Finally, my colleague and good friend, Ambassador Zepos, has said some rather unkind things about my country, and with some reluctance I am compelled to recall the responsibility of Greece for the present situation.

Greece has been heavily implicated in the events that led to the division of Cyprus 26 years ago. Greece not only encouraged but actively participated in the excesses that have yielded the bitter fruit about which it complains so loudly today.

It was Greece that engineered the coup of 1974 in which Mr. Sampson was installed as "President of Cyprus". This notorious killer actually boasted about the number of people he had murdered over the years. In the end, even Archbishop Makarios, whose own hands were not so clean, started to complain about the nefarious role of Greece in Cyprus and accused it of illegally occupying the island. I believe he did so in this very Chamber.

Even after the overthrow of the military régime in 1974, successive Governments in Athens were unable to show the courage or generosity of spirit to foment reconciliation on the island. On the contrary, they have encouraged the most chauvinistic elements among the Greek Cypriots who vow revenge and holy war against their Turkish Cypriot neighbours. How ironic that those who complain about

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

the status quo as being unacceptable are the ones who are making the status quo unalterable.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I thank the representative of Turkey for his kind words addressed to me.

I call on the representative of Greece, who has asked to speak.

Mr. ZEPOS (Greece) (interpretation from French): I regret to take the time of the Council and come back to a question which is from time to time posed by the representative of Turkey. I have frequently said that the question of the events of 1974 forms part of history, and I wish to underscore once and for all what has already been said.

Greece supports faithfully the independence of the Republic of Cyprus. The plot which took place in 1974, carried out by a small number of military personnel, was condemned by all of Greece, and the leaders of that plot at present are serving life sentences for having led such an action against the person of Archbishop Makarios, President of Cyprus at the time.

(Mr. Zepos, Greece)

That is the truth, and I will not accept allegations against me or my country from the representatives of a country whose military presence in Cyprus is in flagrant violation of everything that country tries to be in Europe, everything Turkey claims it defends. This raises very serious questions concerning credibility.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): I call on the representative of Cyprus.

Mr. MAVROMMATIS (Cyprus): I would like to begin with a query. What is a State Member of the United Nations doing in the Security Council when it refuses to accept mandatory Security Council resolutions? Whither do we go, if that is the situation? That applies to Turkey.

Late in the intervention of the representative of Turkey we heard quite a lot of references to guidelines and paragraphs of resolution 649 (1990). It was this very same Security Council that took that decision; resolution 649 (1990) was adopted unanimously. Everybody knows why. There were three reasons. The first was the denial of the role of the Secretary-General, including his right to submit suggestions and ideas; the second was the claim that they were a people; the third was the claim that they were entitled to self-determination. To every one of them, a reply is given in the first operative paragraph of that resolution.

Instead of paying lip service to certain paragraphs of that resolution, is Turkey prepared on this solemn occasion here and now to affirm adherence to the resolution and to withdraw these three untenable claims they have already put forward, which were dealt with by the Security Council resolution in its first operative paragraph? If that is the case, then quite naturally that paves the way to substantive and constructive negotiation.

They referred particularly to violations by Cyprus of article 5. As participants in the European security process, they know full well that States

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

parties are entitled to bring anything connected with the human dimension of human rights before appropriate forums. And the same of course applies a fortiori to the United Nations.

That is all that Cyprus did, and it did so because of the violations by Turkey. And they will come back again to human rights. The only violation of article 5 is the continued influx of the settlers.

The replies we have had today are not just disheartening. What have we heard? The arrogant reply by Turkey. It is alarming, and it fully justifies the action that has to be taken in this respect.

Here I have a Turkish newspaper from Cyprus. It says there are 80,000 Turkish Cypriots and 80,000 Turks from Turkey in the occupied part of Cyprus. If this is not creating an alarming situation, I do not know what is creating it.

But the audacity of referring to Berlin! Berlin was the symbol of lack of freedom of movement. And these are the people that convicted 17-year-old youths. Nobody sentences 17-year-olds to prison simply because they want to cross over and go to their birthplace. Is the meaning of the tumbling-down of walls that we should continue the partition of a small island, and forcibly keep the population of that island apart? If that is the meaning, then they have to comb their own phraseology and explanation of the world.

Human rights. They quoted the State Department, and I accept it, without investigation, as one of the authorititative resources. Why do they not move on another couple of hundred pages and tell us what it says about Turkey? Why do they not tell us what Amnesty International says about Turkey? Why do they not tell us about the three recourses of Cyprus in the Council of Europe, the European Commission of Human Rights, one of the most respected mechanisms in the field of human rights, which has thrice found Turkey, as a result of the invasion and

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

occupation of Cyprus, guilty of murder, rape and denial of almost every right in the statute book?

When somebody speaks about human rights, Turkey might as well keep silent. It has neither the stature nor the moral authority to speak about human rights. I will not go beyond that to things that are happening now, because I do not want to prolong this discussion.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from French): There are no further speakers for this meeting.

Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to state the following.

Following consultations among the members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The members of the Security Council recall Security Council resolution 649 (1990) and other relevant resolutions. They express again their regret that, in the more than 25 years since the establishment of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), it has not been possible to achieve a negotiated settlement for all aspects of the Cyprus problem. They reiterate their full support for the current effort of the Secretary-General in carrying out his mission of good offices concerning Cyprus.

"The members also recall the statement of the President of the Security Council of 30 May 1990 (S/21323) on United Nations peace-keeping operations. They reiterate their view expressed in that statement that peace-keeping operations must be launched and maintained on a sound and secure financial basis. They therefore express their concern at the chronic and ever-deepening financial crisis facing UNFICYP, as described in the Secretary-General's report and in his letter of 31 May 1990 (S/21351) addressed to all States

(The President)

Members of the United Nations and they support his appeal for financial contributions which would enable UNFICYP to continue to carry out the functions for which it was established."

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.